REMARKS

In view of the above amendatory matter and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 11-14, 21-24, 27-30 are amended herein. Claims 31 and 32 have been cancelled. Claims 6, 7, 25 and 26 have not been amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 6, 7, 11-14 and 21-30 are presented for reconsideration.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11-14, 22 and 24-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner asserts that there is no support in the disclosure as filed for the phrase "at least one but not all" of the threads. Although it appears that the drawings do supply support for this feature, for purposes of expediting the successful prosecution of this application, this phrase has been removed from the various claims. Independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to recite that at least one of the threads of the second component member extends along its length at a first lead angle and at least one of the threads of the second component member extends along its length at a second lead angle, the first and second lead angles being different, and the first lead angle is the same as the predetermined lead angle of the threads of the first component member. Independent claims 23 and 24 similarly recite this feature but these features are for the most part reversed within the first and second component members.

Support for the above-discussed features added to the independent claims clearly is shown in the figures and also is provided in at least paragraph 0041 of the application as filed. As specifically shown in Figure 1A of the drawings, a component member 10 includes a protruding portion (thread) 12 that extends along its entire length at a 20 degree angle, and also

includes a protruding portion 14 that extends along its entire length at an 18.5 degree angle. Thus, at least one of threads extends at a first lead angle (e.g., 20 degrees) and at least another one of the threads extends at a second lead angle (e.g., 18.5 degrees), where the first and second lead angles clearly are different.

As also shown in Figure 1A, the other component member 20 includes threads that all extend at the same lead angle (e.g., 20 degrees), and thus this lead angle (called "predetermined lead angle" in the claims) is the same as the lead angle of at least one of the threads within component member 10. Accordingly, each of the features included in each of the independent claims is fully supported by the specification as filed. Moreover, and in view of the foregoing, it is submitted that no new matter has been added. It is therefore requested that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11-14, 22 and 24-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 has been amended to correct the misspelled word "porting" to "portion" thereby providing proper antecedent support for "said open end" in line 10 of claim 1, and also for "the open end portion of said second component member" in lines 3-4 of claim 7. Regarding the Examiner's reference to claim 14, the limitation "said open end portion" does not appear in this claim. It is therefore requested that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh (U.S. Patent 6,913,157) in view of Lynn (U.S. Patent 4,387,822). The Examiner asserts that Oh discloses threads having different lead angles and particularly asserts that member 36 in Oh "is considered a lead of the thread from which it extends." As mentioned above, each of the

independent claims has been amended to recite that at least one of the threads extends along its length at a first lead angle and at least one of the threads extends along its length at a second lead angle, where the first and second lead angles are different. As shown in the various figures in the present application, a thread, such as thread 12, extends along its entire length at an angle of 20 degrees, whereas another thread, such as thread 14, extends along its entire length at an angle of 18.5 degrees.

In contrast to these limitations now recited in each of the independent claims of the present application, Oh shows (e.g., in Figure 3A) an element 36 that extends from element 24a and both of these elements collectively form the thread, as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, Oh shows one thread (elements 36 and 24a combined) that corresponds to none of the threads recited in applicant's claims that extend along their length at a particular (non-changing) lead angle. Accordingly, Oh neither discloses nor suggests having two threads with different lead angles, where each of those threads extends along their respective lengths at such different lead angles.

Moreover, the claimed invention operates in a manner different from how Oh (with or without Lynn) operates. In particular, in the present invention, since at least one of the threads on one of the component members extends along its entire length at one angle which is different from the angle of the entire thread that is disposed on the other component member, fastening between the components begins almost immediately upon rotation of the components relative to one another. This is explained in the application as filed at least in paragraph 0053, where it states that "when the screws of the container and the lid are engaged and rotated, fastening is started with a little rotation since the screws with different lead angles are provided." Oh

operates differently and requires that the container and lid be rotated for some meaningful distance before there is engagement between element 36 disposed on the lid and a thread 22 disposed on the container, as clearly shown in Figures 3B, 3C and 3D in the Oh patent. Thus, the present invention is both structurally and functionally distinct and unobvious over the Oh patent.

Lynn also neither discloses nor suggests the foregoing features recited in each of the independent claims of the present application.

Since neither Oh nor Lynn discloses various features recited in independent claims 1, 21, 23 and 24, as discussed above, the resulting combination of Oh and Lynn does not make obvious the present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 21, 23 and 24. It is therefore requested that the rejection of claims 1, 21, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Since claims 6, 7, 11-14, 22, and 25-30 depend from either claims 1, 21, 23 or 24, the foregoing discussion of these independent claims equally applies to the rejected dependent claims. Therefore, it is requested that the rejection of claims 6, 7, 11-14, 22, and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Mark Montague
Reg. No. 36,612

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P.C
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-6799
(212) 790-9200